PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PD010078	**FOR FURTHER ACTION**	See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)

International application No. PCT/EP02/14266	International filing date *(day/month/year)* 14.12.2002	Priority date *(day/month/year)* 28.12.2001

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC G06F17/30

Applicant THOMSON LICENSING S.A. et al.

1. This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.

   ☐ This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e. sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).

   These annexes consist of a total of   sheets.

3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

   I ☒ Basis of the opinion

   II ☐ Priority

   III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

   IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention

   V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

   VI ☐ Certain documents cited

   VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application

   VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 28.06.2003	Date of completion of this report 09.10.2003
Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority: European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	Authorized Officer vanVoorsttotVoorst,R Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2448

I. Basis of the report

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application *(Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)):*

Description, Pages

1-10   as originally filed

Claims, Numbers

1-5   as originally filed

Drawings, Sheets

1/3-3/3   as originally filed

2. With regard to the **language,** all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

   These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:

   ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).

   ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

   ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application, the international preliminary examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:

   ☐ contained in the international application in written form.

   ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

   ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

   ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

   ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

   ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

   ☐ the description,   pages:

   ☐ the claims,   Nos.:

   ☐ the drawings,   sheets:

5. ☐   This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have
been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).

(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.)

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes:	Claims	1-5
	No:	Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes:	Claims	1-5
	No:	Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes:	Claims	1-5
	No:	Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

D1: SHOENS K ET AL: 'The Rufus system: information organization for semi-
structured data' PROCEEDINGS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON VERY LARGE DATA BASES, XX, XX, 24 August 1993 (1993-08-24),
pages 97-107, XP002151011
D2: US-A-5 864 870 (GUCK RANDAL LEE) 26 January 1999 (1999-01-26)
D3: GB-A-2 212 636 (AMOCO CORP) 26 July 1989 (1989-07-26)
D4: 'Unix 'file' command' UNIX MANUAL, [Online] XP002216604 Retrieved
from the Internet: <URL:http://www.rt.com/man/file.1.html> [retrieved on
2002-10-14]

Re Item V
**Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step
or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1). According to the present application, in devices providing a Data Base
Management System DBMS for handling incoming data, including incoming
metadata (data about data), it is necessary to classify said incoming data, since
different processing is necessary for different kinds of metadata.

The problem to be solved by the present invention is to classify the data
automatically, such that a DBMS can utilize the result of the classification for
correct data handling.

The application discloses that two types of classification (see Figure 1) are used
which are complementing to each other.

According to the first classification, metadata M can be defined as data sets
consisting of a first part MD_LINK being a machine-interpretable link pointing to a
reference data set, and of a second part MD_LOAD being any data referring to
said link. Any data item that does not contain at least one MD_LINK and a related
MD_LOAD is defined as Essence E. A mixture C of said data M and said data E is
called Container Data (HTML files or PDF files).

According to the second classification, the data are defined to be Physical Data
PD (picture stored in GIF format), if the device has a method for interpretation of
the data format and for displaying the data as a picture, otherwise the data are

defined as Abstract Data AD, for example text files which cannot be interpreted through the device.

2). Method claim 1 is directed to the automatic detection of data types for data type dependent processing by a technical device, and is based on Figure 5. At first the format is detected (D1) of the data received, and the detected format is used in a first evaluation (D3) to determine whether the received data is M, E or C data. Then, if the data is M or E, in a second evaluation (D4) it is determined whether the technical device is able to interpret the received data for reproducing a physical representation (displayable picture) of said data. The results of the first and second evaluation are supplied to a device or process for data type dependent processing of said input data.

3). The cited prior art does not disclose the use of the first and second classification as specified in the present application.